

**In the United States**  
**Circuit Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

HARRY C. CLAIR,

*Appellant,*

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Appellee.*

---

**APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF**

Upon Appeal from the District Court of the  
United States, for the District of Oregon.

---

HAMPSON, KOERNER, YOUNG & SWETT,  
JAMES C. DEZENDORF,  
*Attorneys for Appellant,*  
800 Pacific Building,  
Portland 4, Oregon.

**FILED**

**OCT 27 1944**

**PAUL P. O'BRIEN,**  
CLERK



No. 10805

**In the United States  
Circuit Court of Appeals**

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

HARRY C. CLAIR,

*Appellant,*

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Appellee.*

---

**APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF**

Upon Appeal from the District Court of the  
United States, for the District of Oregon.

---

As counsel for the Government have pointed out in their brief, the questions presented on the appeals herein are identical with the questions raised under Specifications of Error I and VI in the companion case of E. C. Shevlin Company vs. United States of America, Appeals Nos. 10619 and 10802 in this court.

Because counsel for the Government have incorporated

in their brief in this case by reference their arguments made in connection with Specifications of Error I and VI in the Shevlin case, we desire to incorporate herein, as a reply to the Government's brief, our reply brief in the Shevlin case.

We therefore respectfully request that this court refer to the reply brief in the Shevlin case for the answer to the Government's contentions under Specifications of Error I and II herein.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMPSON, KOERNER, YOUNG & SWETT,  
JAMES C. DEZENDORF,  
*Attorneys for Appellant.*